Remarks

The Office Action mailed February 6, 2008, and made final, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-25 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-27 are rejected. Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 26, and 27 have been canceled.

Initially, Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner has not fully addressed the limitation "calculating a phase of each of the generated images based on an average of phases of a plurality of points of a respiratory cycle of a motion of the object." More specifically, the Examiner has not pointed to any citations within the cited references that describe or suggest calculating a phase *of each generated image based on an average of phases of a plurality of points of a respiratory cycle of a motion of an object.* (Emphasis added.) The Examiner has merely asserted at page 6 of the Office Action that Okerlund describes a controller that "computes phases of the images (col. 10, lines 31-47)." However, merely computing phases of images, as allegedly described in Okerlund, does not describe or suggest calculating a phase *of each generated image based on an average of phases of a plurality of points of a respiratory cycle of a motion of an object.* (Emphasis added.)

The rejection of Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is respectfully traversed.

The test for definiteness under Section 112, second paragraph, is whether "those skilled in the art would understand what is claimed when the claim is read in light of the specification." (MPEP 2173.02, quoting *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565, 1576, 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986)). If one skilled in the art is able to ascertain the meaning of the claimed terms in light of the specification, 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is satisfied.

The Examiner, at page 3 of the Office Action, asserts that "it is unclear as to how is calculated [*sic*] the phase of each generated image." Applicants respectfully traverse such an assertion and respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the metes and bounds of how the phase is calculated for each generated image, as recited in the presently pending claims. In light of the above-discussed standard, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' originally-filed specification clearly and definitely describes how to calculate a phase for each generated image. For example, at paragraphs [0051]-[0056], Applicants describe that a phase for each image is calculated by obtaining image data and respiratory signal data, calculating scan times for each image, obtaining respiratory sample points from the respiratory signal data, and using the scan times to calculate a phase for each valid respiratory sample point. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand how to calculate a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images in light of Applicants' specification. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112, second paragraph rejection of the presently pending claims be withdrawn.

Moreover, at page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that because how to calculate a phase for each image is unclear, "it is also unclear as to how is sorted [*sic*] the generated images based on the specify [*sic*] target range to generate a series of images." Applicants respectfully traverse such an assertion and respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the metes and bounds of how the generated images are sorted in to a series of images, as recited in the presently pending claims. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' originally-filed specification clearly and definitely describes how to calculate a phase for each generated image and how to sort generated images based on a target range to generate a series of images. For example, at paragraphs [0057]-[0059], Applicants describe that images are sorted by forming groups of images and selecting one image from each group based on a target phase and a phase tolerance. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand how to sort generated images based on at least one target phase within a physiological cycle of motion of an object to generate at least one set of images in light of Applicants' specification. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112, second paragraph rejection of the presently pending claims be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejection of Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-27 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 21, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Okerlund (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,117) (herein after referred to as "Okerlund") is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion at page 5 of the Office Action that "calculating phases of the images, would be inherently met by the disclosure [of Okerlund]." The MPEP at § 2112 recites that "[t]he fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic." (Emphasis in original). Rather, "the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." (MPEP § 2112 (quoting Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1990) (emphasis in original)). Applicants respectfully submit that the assertion of inherency is not proper because the Examiner has not provided any basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to support that the assertion that a controller that calculates phases of images necessarily flows from the teachings of Okerlund, nor has the Examiner provided any basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to support the assertion that Okerlund inherently meets the limitations of the presently pending claims necessarily flows from the teachings of Okerlund.

Only after the Examiner presents evidence and/or reasoning tending to show inherency in a reference appearing to be substantially identical to the claimed invention does the burden shift to the Applicants to show an unobvious difference. MPEP § 2112. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the allegedly inherent teachings do not necessarily flow from the teachings of Okerlund. More specifically, Okerlund describes a computer that generates separate image sets for each phase period of a sub-volume. Okerlund does not include any description that the phases for each image are calculated and, as such, the computer of Okerlund does not calculate a phase *of each generated image based on an average of phases of a plurality of points of a respiratory cycle of a motion of an object*. Accordingly, Okerlund does not describe or suggest calculating a phase *of each generated image based on an average of phases of a plurality of points of a respiratory cycle of a motion of an object.* (Emphasis added.)

However, Applicants have amended the recitation "calculating a phase of each of the generated images based on an average of phases of a plurality of points of a respiratory cycle of a motion of the object" to recite "calculating a phase of each of the generated images based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images." Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner address the amended recitation as a whole and, in the event the Examiner maintains his rejections of the claims in view of the cited references, request that the Examiner clearly delineate and point out the features disclosed by cited references that the Examiner believes corresponds to the features recited in the claims.

Okerlund describes a method for generating an optimally registered working set of computer tomography images. A Region of Interest, or a ROI, (43) is divided into separate sub-volumes (122, 124 ...134) that each correspond to a diastolic phase (DP) of a patient. Each separately acquired image set (106, 108...118) corresponds to one of the sub-volumes (122, 124...134) such that each image set (106, 108...118) corresponds to the diastolic phase (DP). A system operator selects a specific phase point (SP) from within the diastolic phase (DP) at which an image reconstructor (68) should create transaxial slice images. The reconstructor (68) retrieves a sub-set of image data corresponding to a phase range (Ψ_N) centered on the phase location (SP) to generate a transaxial slice image set (106(Ψ_N), 108(Ψ_N)...118(Ψ_N)). Each transaxial slice image set (106(Ψ_N), 108(Ψ_N)...118(Ψ_N)) corresponds to one of the ROI sub-volumes (122, 124...134).

To facilitate aligning the transaxial slice image sets (106(Ψ_N), 108(Ψ_N)...118(Ψ_N)), the diastolic phase (DP) is sub-divided into separate phase ranges (Ψ_{N-2}, Ψ_{N-1}, Ψ_N, Ψ_{N+1}, Ψ_{N+2}), where one phase dependent image slice data set (112(Ψ_{N-2}), 112(Ψ_{N-1}), 112(Ψ_N), 112(Ψ_{N+1}), 112(Ψ_{N+2})) corresponds to a respective phase range (Ψ_{N-2}, Ψ_{N-1}, Ψ_N, Ψ_{N+1}, Ψ_{N+2}). The acquired image sets (106, 108...118) corresponding to adjacent ROI sub-volumes (122, 124 ...134) are compared to identify an optimal working set that includes a separate acquired image set (106, 108...118) that corresponds to a respective ROI sub-volume (122, 124 ...134). A phase dependent image slice image set (112(Ψ_{N-2}), 112(Ψ_{N-1}), 112(Ψ_{N+1}), 112(Ψ_{N+2})) from another phase within the sub-volume image set (106, 108...118) is substituted for a misaligned image set (112(Ψ_N)) to facilitate increasing the diagnostic characteristics of an optimal working image set such that the optimal set includes image sets (106, 108...118) taken at different phase ranges (Ψ_{N-2}, Ψ_{N-1}, Ψ_N, Ψ_{N+1}, Ψ_{N+2}). Notably, Okerlund does not describe or suggest calculating a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images.

Claim 1 recites a method for retrospective internal gating, said method comprising "scanning a patient to obtain projection data . . . generating images from the projection data . . . obtaining a signal representing information regarding a physiological cycle of motion of an object within the patient . . . associating a plurality of points of the physiological cycle with each of the generated images . . . calculating a phase of each of the generated images based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images . . . specifying at least one target phase in the physiological cycle of motion . . . and sorting the generated images based on the at least one target phase within the physiological cycle of motion of the object to generate at least one set of images."

Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a method for retrospective internal gating as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a method that includes calculating a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a method that includes associating a plurality of points of a physiological cycle with each generated image. Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images*. (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 6 and 7 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 6 and 7 likewise are patentable over Okerlund.

Claim 11 recites a system for imaging a moving object within a patient, the system comprising "a scanner configured to acquire projection data of the patient . . . an image reconstructor configured to generate images corresponding to the projection data . . . and a controller configured to . . . receive a signal representing information regarding a cycle of motion of the object . . . receive generated images from said image reconstructor . . . associate a plurality of points of the cycle of motion with each of the generated images . . . calculate a phase of each of the generated images based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images . . . enable a user to specify at least one target phase within the cycle of motion . . . and sort the generated images based on the at least one target phase within the cycle of motion of the object to generate at least one set of images."

Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a system for imaging a moving object as recited in Claim 11. More specifically, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a system that includes a controller configured to calculate a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a system that includes a controller configured to associate a plurality of points of a cycle of motion with each generated image. Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images.* (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 11 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from independent Claim 11. When the recitations of Claims 16 and 17 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 11, Applicants submit that Claims 16 and 17 likewise are patentable over Okerlund.

Claim 21 recites a system for imaging a moving object within a patient, the system comprising "a computed tomography (CT) scanner configured to acquire projection data of the patient . . . an image reconstructor coupled to the CT scanner and configured to generate images corresponding to the projection data . . . and a controller coupled to the image reconstructor and configured to . . . receive a signal representing information regarding a cycle of motion of the object . . . receive generated images from said image reconstructor . . . associate a plurality of points of the cycle of motion with each of the generated images . . . calculate a phase of each of the generated images based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images . . . enable a user to specify at least one target phase within the cycle of motion . . . and sort the generated images based on the at least one target phase within the cycle of motion of the object to generate at least one set of images."

Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a system for imaging a moving object as recited in Claim 21. More specifically, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a system that includes a controller coupled to the image reconstructor and configured to calculate a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a system that includes a controller coupled to the image reconstructor and configured to associate a plurality of points of a cycle of motion with each generated image. Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images*. (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 21 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund.

Claim 22 recites a computer configured to "instruct a scanner to acquire projection data of the patient . . . instruct an image reconstructor to generate images corresponding to the projection data . . . receive a signal representing information regarding a cycle of motion of the object . . . receive generated images from the image reconstructor . . . associate a plurality of points of the cycle of motion with each of the generated images . . . calculate a phase of each of the generated images based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images . . . enable a user to specify at least one target phase within the cycle of motion . . . and sort the generated images based on the at least one target phase within the cycle of motion of the object to generate at least one set of images."

Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a computer as recited in Claim 22. More specifically, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a computer configured to calculate a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a computer configured to associate a plurality of points of a cycle of motion with each generated image. Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images*. (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 22 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund.

Claim 24 recites a computer-readable medium encoded with a program configured to "instruct a scanner to acquire projection data of the patient . . . instruct an image reconstructor to generate images corresponding to the projection data . . . receive a signal representing information regarding a cycle of motion of the object . . . receive generated images from the image reconstructor . . . associate a plurality of points of the cycle of motion with each of the generated images . . . calculate a phase of each of the generated images based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images . . . enable a user to specify at least one target phase within the cycle of motion . . . and sort the generated images based on the at least one target phase within the cycle of motion of the object to generate at least one set of images."

Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a computer-readable medium as recited in Claim 24. More specifically, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a program configured to calculate a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, Okerlund does not describe nor suggest a program configured to associate a plurality of points of a cycle of motion with each generated image. Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images*. (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 24 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 21, 22, and 24 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 2-5, 8, 12-15, 18, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,006,862) ("Kaufman") in further view of Heuscher et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0007593) ("Heuscher") is respectfully traversed.

Okerlund is described above. Kaufman describes a gating method used to select a plurality of images that are obtained during diastole. More specifically, heart frequency information is used, along with information obtained with a plurality of derivative filters, to obtain time and phase information for generating an image in which a heart is at its largest volume.

Heuscher describes a computed tomography imaging method. In the method, electrocardiograph (ECG) data is analyzed (108) to identify a number of cardiac cycles corresponding to a selected number of cardiac cycles (106), and to identify a temporal point in each cardiac cycle corresponding to an occurrence of a selected cardiac state (110).

Claims 2-5, and 8 depend from independent Claim 1, which is recited above.

None of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a method for retrospective internal gating as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, none of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a method that includes calculating a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, none of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a method that includes associating a plurality of points of a physiological cycle with each generated image.

Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images*. (Emphasis added.) Kaufman describes generating an image in which a heart is at its largest volume by obtaining time and phase information, and Heuscher describes identifying a number of cardiac cycles corresponding to a selected number of cardiac cycles and identifying a temporal point in each cardiac cycle corresponding to an occurrence of a selected cardiac state by analyzing electrocardiograph data.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman, in further view of Heuscher.

When the recitations of Claims 2-5, and 8 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-5, and 8 likewise are patentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman, in further view of Heuscher.

Claims 12-15, and 18 depend from independent Claim 11, which is recited above.

None of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a system for imaging a moving object as recited in Claim 11. More specifically, none of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a system that includes a controller configured to calculate a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, none of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a system that includes a controller configured to associate a plurality of points of a cycle of motion with each generated image.

Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images*. (Emphasis added.) Kaufman describes generating an image in which a heart is at its largest volume by obtaining time and phase information, and Heuscher describes identifying a number of cardiac cycles corresponding to a selected number of cardiac cycles and identifying a temporal point in each cardiac cycle corresponding to an occurrence of a selected cardiac state by analyzing electrocardiograph data.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 11 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman, in further view of Heuscher.

When the recitations of Claims 12-15, and 18 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 11, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 12-15, and 18 likewise are patentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman, in further view of Heuscher.

Claim 23 depends from Claim 22, which is recited above.

None of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a computer as recited in Claim 22. More specifically, none of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a computer configured to calculate a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, none of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a computer configured to associate a plurality of points of a cycle of motion with each generated image.

Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images*. (Emphasis added.) Kaufman describes generating an image in which a heart is at its largest volume by obtaining time and phase information, and Heuscher describes identifying a number of cardiac cycles corresponding to a selected number of cardiac cycles and identifying a temporal point in each cardiac cycle corresponding to an occurrence of a selected cardiac state by analyzing electrocardiograph data.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 22 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman, in further view of Heuscher.

When the recitations of Claim 23 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 22, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 23 likewise is patentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman, in further view of Heuscher.

Claim 25 depends from independent Claim 24, which is recited above.

None of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a computer-readable medium as recited in Claim 24. More specifically, none of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a computer-readable medium encoded with a program configured to calculate a phase of each generated image based on an average of phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images. Furthermore, none of Okerlund, Kaufman, and Heuscher, considered alone or in combination, describe nor suggest a program configured to associate a plurality of points of a cycle of motion with each generated image.

Rather, Okerlund describes subdividing an region of interest based on a diastolic phase, retrieving a transaxial slice image set corresponding to each sub-volume of the region of interest, retrieving a phase dependent slice image set corresponding to each phase range within the diastolic phase, and substituting a phase dependent slice image set for a misaligned one of the transaxial slice image sets. A description of acquiring separate image sets for each diastolic phase is not a description of calculating a phase of each generated image *based on an average of* *phases of a respective plurality of points associated with each of the generated images.* (Emphasis added.) Kaufman describes generating an image in which a heart is at its largest volume by obtaining time and phase information, and Heuscher describes identifying a number of cardiac cycles corresponding to a selected number of cardiac cycles and identifying a temporal point in each cardiac cycle corresponding to an occurrence of a selected cardiac state by analyzing electrocardiograph data.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 24 is submitted to be patentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman, in further view of Heuscher.

When the recitations of Claim 25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 23, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 25 likewise is patentable over Okerlund in view of Kaufman, in further view of Heuscher.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 2-5, 8, 12-15, 18, 23, and 25 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Zychlewicz
Registration No. 51,366
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070